



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

yy

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/652,933	08/28/2003	Zheng J. Li	PC11724G	2645
28523	7590	09/12/2005	EXAMINER	
PFIZER INC. PATENT DEPARTMENT, MS8260-1611 EASTERN POINT ROAD GROTON, CT 06340			PESELEV, ELLI	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1623	

DATE MAILED: 09/12/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

H Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/652,933

Applicant(s)

LI ET AL.

Examiner

Elli Peselev

Art Unit

1623

*— The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address —
Period for Reply*

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 13 July 2005.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 126-145 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 126-145 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 - a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date: _____ . |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date: _____ . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ . |

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Claims 126-145 are provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1, 5, 7-9, 11-14, 16-23, 25-27, 29, 31, 33-37, 39-45 and 48-51 of copending Application No. 10/327,459. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because a pharmaceutical composition comprising form F azithromycin encompasses a dry blend comprising form F azithromycin.

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

Claims 126-145 are provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 15-36 of copending Application No. 10/387,383. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because a pharmaceutical composition containing azithromycin form F is *prima facie* obvious over a granule containing azithromycin form F.

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

Claims 126-145 are provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1, 3-9, 11-13 and 15 of copending Application No. 10/355,575. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because a pharmaceutical composition comprising azithromycin form F is *prima facie* obvious over a pharmaceutical composition comprising dry granulated particles form F.

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

Claims 126-145 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention. The instant claims encompass azithromycin form F in a pharmaceutically acceptable carrier or diluent i.e. the instant claims read on an aqueous composition comprising crystalline azithromycin form F. However, there is a good reason to doubt that a crystalline structure of the compound can be maintained in aqueous environment. Insofar as the instant claims encompass a dry composition such as a tablet, there is a good reason to doubt that the crystalline compound encompassed by the instant claims can retain its crystalline structure under compression. Note the article by Rouhi ("Right Stuff", Chemical and Engineering News, Feb. 24, 2003, pages 32-35). According to that

article, it is an enormous challenge to manufacturers as to how a favorable polymorph can be maintained in a pharmaceutical composition.

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Claims 126-145 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Bright (U.S. Patent No. 4,474,768).

Bright discloses a pharmaceutical composition comprising azithromycin (column 6, lines 59-67). Insofar as the instant claims encompass an aqueous composition, form F azithromycin is not expected to retain its crystalline structure and said composition reads on a composition disclosed by Bright. As for as the instant claims read on the solid composition, note that Bright discloses crystallization of azithromycin from ethanol (column 9, Example 3). The form F azithromycin encompassed by the instant claims is seen to be the same or substantially the same as the crystalline compound disclosed by Bright.

Applicant's arguments, Terminal Disclaimer and Affidavit filed July 13, 2005 have been considered and have been found persuasive insofar as the rejection of the instant claims over the copending application 10/650,253 and the Singer et al patent are concerned.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Elli Peselev whose telephone number is (571) 272-0659. The examiner can normally be reached on 8.00-4.30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, James Wilson can be reached on (571) 272-0661. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 1623

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Elli Peselev

Ellie Peselev
ELLI PESELEV
PRIMARY EXAMINER
GROUP 1200